

PORTER'S CLAIM.

TWENTY-FOUR THOUSAND DOLLARS,

**Man Not Entitled to It, Leaving Him
Without a Cent—A Some-
what Curious Case.**

A case involving some \$24,000 was recently disposed of by Secretary Blaine, which has caused considerable ill-feeling between Dr. R. H. Porter, who was the plaintiff, and the Secretary. Dr. Porter claims that Mr. Blaine rendered his decision in the case without the slightest warrant of law. The case in question was for a long time before Secretary Evans, and he was unable to settle it. When the Secretary worked hard with the parties interested to bring about a compromise, His efforts, however, were unsuccessful, owing to the stubbornness of one of the parties, and the matter was allowed to go for action by the new administration. It was not until the new Secretary took office that the case was decided, as will be shown below. The facts in the case are as follows:

SHORTLY AFTER THE CLOSE

Maximo, for what purpose, none but their immediate friends knew. While traveling through that country they were all three murdered, as it was alleged, by Mexican soldiers. When the joint commission of the two governments of the United States and Mexico was organized, the purpose of adjudicating the claims of the claimants against the two governments the representatives of these three men

EMPLOYED MR. PORTER
to look after the claims. Mr. Porter went to Missouri, where the heirs of the three men lived, and made arrangements with a man named Musser to get power of attorney from the heirs and make a contract for fees. Musser succeeded in getting the necessary contract from the heirs, and then he did, upon the agreement being that the heirs in each case should pay one-half of all moneys collected. Musser took the

and prosecuted the cases to a successful termination, the amount of damages in the three cases amounting to nearly \$172,000. About \$85,000 were paid to the families of the victims by the government to the Secretary of State, one-half of which was paid over to the heirs of the murdered man by Mr. Everts. The other half remained in the Treasury until recently, when, by order of Secretary Blaine, was paid over to the heirs of the murdered man. While a broker doing business in New York city. Several equity suits were some years ago commenced in the Supreme Court of the District by persons claiming to have made contracts with Porter, by which they were to receive a certain percentage of his net (Porter's) fees for services rendered and to be rendered by them in the prosecution of these cases.

that these parties were not entitled to anything for services rendered to him, except the points, a few of which were paid, and the balance was paid in the form of the suits. Porter and White were both made defendants in these equity suits and were both jointly interested in defeating them. The counsel for the two parties combined to bring the suits on in the Supreme Court of the District some two months ago. Now comes the sequel of Porter's connection with White. Mr. White, about the years 1875 or 1876, after the awards had been made,

instead of being in the nature of loans, were in fact absolute purchases by him of the two cases. When the owner of the cases, White, learned that White claimed to be the owner of these cases he notified Secretary Evans not to pay Mr. White any money, and revoked the power of attorney which he had given to him, and then there began a contest between Porter and White before the State Department for the possession of the funds.

ABOUT THIS TIME there appeared upon the scene another interested party in the person of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Missouri man, who was in the early stages of the case. Musser also claimed part of the fees due Porter. Mr. White, fearing additional trouble, promptly bought Musser's interests, and took assignment for them. Porter denied that Musser had any interest in the case, and that he was not entitled that he had simply employed him as an

attorney to procure him (Forster) the power of attorney to act for the heirs of the murdered man. The parties were fully heard before Secretary Everts in the fall of 1880, and

THE SECRETARY DECIDED

that the parties who were prosecuting the equity suits had no liens upon the funds, and he would not consider their claims in adjudicating upon the matter. As between Porter and White he declined to make a decision. This was the substance of what he said that if they, by mutual consent or otherwise, would join in a receipt to the Department payment of the instalments then on hand would be made on such joint receipt; but if they refused, the matter would be referred to the court. This letter was dated October 9, 1880. Mr. White being dissatisfied with the decision of Secretary Everts, made a request of the Secretary for a rehearing; but the Secretary, in a

After dated December 2, 1880, addressed in duplicate to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Attorney General, and declined to RE-HEAR THE CASE, and adhered to his determination expressed in the letter of October 9. After this decision had been referred to the Secretary, Mr. Porter made repeated efforts to effect a compromise between the White and the Heintke, which they might comply with the Secretary's requirements, but White refused to entertain any proposition of adjustment between them. Mr. Porter thereupon, through his attorney, General S. S. Henkle, filed a bill in equity against White for the turning over to him of the fund which he claimed in the fund held by the Secretary of State.

BEFORE MR. WHITE

had answered the bill the equity cases hereinbefore referred to were argued in the court in general term and finally dismissed. The following is the opinion of the court, rendered on the application to the Secretary, Blaine for the payment of the amount of the

installments that were then on hand. Mr. Blaine as Porter alleges, promptly paid over the money, \$25,000, notwithstanding

TRUE FACTS OF PORTER

and his attorney, and the fact of the pendency of the suit in equity to determine the rights as to the fund. The bill filed by Mr. Porter has never been answered by White. Mr. Porter claims that the Secretary of the church is a layman, and that the church is a layman judgment without any warrant of law. Mr. White is a prominent stock broker in New York and a member in good standing of Henry Ward Beecher's church. When Mr. Beecher was last in Washington he, in company with Mr. Bond, Mr. Porter and Mr. Bond, upon Secretary Blaine and testified to the good character of Mr. White. Dr. Porter and his friends say that the Secretary, after this interview with these distinguished people, did not look

swant the money to White, Colucci, Bob, who was the attorney for White, it is said, received a fee of \$5,000.

Interior Department Changes.

Secretary Kirkwood's recent visit to Iowa is stated not to have been solely devoted to repairing fences, but related to the more important business of a reorganization of the Interior Department. It is an established fact that he held a conference with leading men of the State, in which he stated that at present the Interior Department was being run by a clique, and that the reorganization was to be better and to rid some of the present heads of bureaus. The changes, it is stated, will occur the 1st proximo, and among those who are shining marks for the official guideline are Assistant Secretary Alonzo Bell

their successors will be is not definitely known, but Iowa men are sanguine that the Secretary has not forgotten his own State in the matter. A consultation will be held Monday between the President and Secretary Kirkwood relative to the appointment of a Commissioner of the General Land Office.

♦

An Ex-Senator Killed.

RICHFIELD SPRINGS, N. Y., June 10.—Ex-Senator A. B. Ellwood was accidentally killed this morning by falling through a stairway at the American Hotel.